THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII OCTOBER, 1950 No. 364

Editorial

THE authors of *Catholicity*, the Report which was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1947 and which we warmly commended at the time of its appearance,[1] said with regard to the section that dealt with "Orthodox Protestantism": "We shall endeavour in this section of our Report to present a general description of Protestantism, such as Protestants themselves may recognize to be truthful and fair-minded." This intention was, we are sure, as sincere as it was laudable. But in March, 1949, we published an article by Bishop Gustaf Aulén in which he maintained that, despite its very valuable qualities, *Catholicity* had gravely misrepresented in several important respects the teaching of Lutheranism. There has now appeared another Report to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the preparation of which was prompted by the same questions as the Archbishop had addressed to the group that produced *Catholicity*, viz.:

> (1) What is the underlying cause—philosophical and theological—of the contrast or conflict between the Catholic and Protestant traditions?
> (2) What are the fundamental points of doctrine at which the contrast or conflict crystallizes?
> (3) Is a synthesis at these points possible?
> (4) If a synthesis is not possible, can they co-exist within on eecclesiastical body and under what conditions?

The new Report is entitled *The Catholicity of Protestantism*.[2] It is edited by Dr R. Newton Flew and the Rev. Rupert E. Davies and is the work of a distinguished group of Free Church theologians. This is a considerably larger booklet than *Catholicity*, although its scope is more limited. We are inclined to regret that this group did not get to work concurrently with the authors of *Catholicity* and produce a quite independent Report about the same time. We should like to have seen how they would set about answering the Archbishop's questions *de novo*.

As it is, their Report is dominated by a concern to correct the description of Protestantism in *Catholicity*, mainly with reference to the teaching of Luther himself. It is certainly a great gain to have the essentials of Protestant theology so clearly expounded and so carefully documented. We do not see how anyone can fail to admit that *Catholicity* did contain serious misrepresentations at this point, and there was certainly need for the kind of explanation that the new Report supplies. It is indeed surprising to find any group of English theologians, whether Nonconformist or Anglican, so well versed in Luthers teaching as the members of this group, and

[1] See THEOLOGY, August, 1947, pp. 281 f. [2] Lutterworth Press, 5s.

apparently so indebted to him.[1] The Report by itself might give the impression that Luther has had through the centuries, and has now, far more influence on English Protestants than is in fact the case. We should have welcomed rather fewer references to the works of Luther and a good many more to the works of English divines. But the authors would probably say that their preoccupation with Luther was determined by *Catholicity's* conspicuous misunderstanding of him.

Anyhow, we have here a splendidly positive account of what Protestants at their best have always contended for and of what by and large, as the authors point out, the Church of England itself is committed to, although it is not, and we hope never will be, committed to Protestant*ism*, or to any other "ism" for that matter. This Report makes a big contribution to inter-church understanding, and should obviate many common misconceptions about "natural theology", justification by faith and the relation between the Gospel and the Church.

At the same time, we wish the authors had been as courageous as the authors of *Catholicity,* and had attempted to make a more thorough and comprehensive estimate of traditions other than their own. This might have revealed that they too are subject to serious misunderstandings which need to be cleared up. On p. 79 (cp. p. 86) they make this remarkable assertion: "By it [*i.e.* faith] we are forgiven; we do not *hope* to be forgiven, which is all the 'catholic' view of faith allows us—we *are* forgiven" (italics theirs). They do not document this assertion, and the reader is left to guess what formulary or theological statements they have in mind. Is not this as grave a misrepresentation as any of which the authors themselves have to complain?

It does at any rate appear that there is still plenty of room for the further exploration of differences, and the Report concludes with the useful suggestion that the subject that most needs further investigaton is the nature of authority and the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. It would undoubtedly set matters forward if a new, mixed group would produce a report on this subject. What has already been published shows that the conditions for theological reconciliation are much more favourable than might have been supposed. But it is important to remember that church unity will not be attained simply by theological agreement. It is one thing for theologians to agree, or to agree to differ; it is another thing for congregations to unite. There are forces of social pressure and differences of habit and ethos which, though not taken into account in a strictly theological discussion, might equally well, and perhaps with equal advantage, be methodically studied.

[1] But it is disconcerting to discover that it does not seem to have occurred to any member of the group to correct the statement on p. 79 that "the Homily on Salvation" is "*in* the Book of Common Prayer".

Dr Johnson and the Prayer Book[1]

By way of introducing us to his hero's marvellous powers of memory, Boswell recounts an episode which took place in 1712, when Johnson was three years old, and his father's house—that charming Queen Anne house, now a museum, which we can visit to-day in Lichfield market-place—was only a year or two older. It was "told me", says Boswell, "in his presence at Lichfield, in 1776, by his step-daughter, Mrs Lucy Porter, as related to her by his mother. When he was a child in petticoats, and had learnt to read, Mrs Johnson put the common prayer-book into his hands, pointed to the collect for the day, and said, 'Sam, you must get this by heart.' She went upstairs, leaving him to study it: but by the time she had reached the second floor, she heard him following her. 'What's the matter?' said she. 'I can say it,' he replied; and repeated it distinctly, though he could not have read it more than twice."[2]

Here let me insert a general apology, if, among some fresh thoughts, I am obliged to refer to many familiar sayings and stories. I shall not offer deprecations such as the nervous and inconsequent "of course" or the embarrassing "you will remember" or the devastating "as every schoolboy knows". Some stories bear repetition if they are repeated accurately, as all good children and teachers know.

Even before he was three years old, Johnson had interesting connexions with church services. Miss Adye of Lichfield remembered seeing the child at the cathedral "perched upon his father's shoulders, listening and gaping at the celebrated preacher", Dr. Sacheverell, when, "young as he was", his father "believed that he had caught the public spirit and zeal" for that High-Church Divine. And Johnson himself had a faint remembrance of being taken by his mother, at the age of $2\frac{1}{2}$, on the suggestion of Sir John Floyer, then a physician in Lichfield, to be touched by Queen Anne for the King's Evil, from which touch he derived no benefit, a fact which did not upset his sturdy Toryism. "He had, he said, a confused but somehow a sort of solemn recollection of a lady in diamonds and a long black hood." The office used on this occasion seems to have been printed in some Prayer Books from Charles II until 1719. The form used by Anne is summarized in Proctor and Frere. It is a dignified form enough, having been simplified in this reign on Prayer-Book lines from the earlier forms. The ceremony, apparently first practised in England by the Angevin kings as a testimony of their own sacred character, had been dropped by James I, and avoided as superstitious by William of Orange. The Tories, however, were much attached to it; and it was practised by other sovereigns as late as Anne, the last occasion being April 27, 1714; after which the Hanoverians finally

[1] A Paper read to the Swansea Junior Clergy Association on December 5, 1949, and to the Brecon Clerical Society on January 2, 1950.

[2] Quotations are from Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (ed. 1811), except where otherwise noted.

abandoned it.[1] Little Sam Johnson must thus have been one of the last persons to participate in the rite.

A love of the Book of Common Prayer, and in especial of the collects, remained with him to the end of his days. At the end of his life he gave to his friend Bennet Langton a number of Latin epigrams in MS, of which three are known to have been composed in his last year, after his first paralytic stroke. One was written to test his intellect, when he had temporarily lost the power of speech; and six of them are metrical versions of Prayer-Book collects, asking for true penitence and peace at the last. One of the best "in all probability . . . his last poem", is a paraphrase of what we call the Collect for Purity:

Summe Deus, cui caeca patent penetralia cordis,
Quem nulla anxietas, nulla cupido fugit. . . .
Mentibus afflatu terrenas ejice sordes
Divino, sanctus regnet ut intus amor. . . .[2]

And this bears the date of December 5, 1784, the day when he received his last communion in bed, eight days before he died.

Between these memorable first and last uses of the collects there stretched seventy-three years of devout life, pivoted on the Prayer Book. According to Johnson's own account, Sunday was to him a heavy day in childhood, as he was confined and forced to read *The Whole Duty of Man*; "and still I find a great reluctance to go to church." It was only at Oxford that he began to think seriously of religion, having taken up Law's *Serious Call*, and found it "quite an overmatch for" him. In the intervening years of adolescence he remembered being "a sort of lax talker against religion". But even so, as we know from another source, he wrote at the age of 17 a kind of office hymn for the surprising feast of St Simon and St Jude, which is no worse than bespoke hymns are apt to be, its quaintest lines being:

Nor whilst she Simon's acts pursues
Art thou forgotten by the Muse,
Most venerable Jude;

and its best, perhaps:

In vain proud tyrants strove to shake
Their faith, or force them to forsake
The steps their Saviour trod;
With breasts resolv'd, they follow'd still
Obsequious to his heav'nly will
Their master and their God.[3]

The deep personal devotion for which his manhood is remarkable seems to begin with his wife's death in 1752. But there is evidence also of strong piety at least at the turning points of life, or the start of an enterprise like *The Rambler*, from his thirtieth year onwards.

[1] M. Bloch, *Les Rois Thaumaturges*, 41-9, 390-1.
[2] *Poems* (Oxford, 1941), 206-8, 232.
[3] *Poems*, 78-80.

He was a staunch High Churchman according to the standards of his day. "He that believes in the divine right of Kings", he said to old Mrs Langton, "believes in a Divinity. . . . He that believes in the divine right of Bishops believes in the divine authority of the Christian religion. . . ." "The Tory is not for giving more legal power to the Clergy", he said to Boswell, "but wishes they should have a considerable influence, founded on the opinion of mankind: the Whig is for limiting and watching them with a narrow jealousy." Among the anfractuosities of his mind there must have been frequent collisions between his wide human sympathy for honest aspiration and his orthodox conviction. Boswell says that, though Johnson was a steady Church of England man, there was much agreeable intercourse between him and divines of different communions, mentioning two Moravians, the English Benedictines at Paris, Dr Thomas Hussey, Roman Catholic chaplain at the French Embassy, and the Presbyterian Dr James Fordyce. But plainly Boswell is right in saying that Johnson loved a Presbyterian least of all; and he found the Catholic more sufferable than the Protestant dissenters. Methodists were not yet dissenters. Speaking of the inward light, to which some "pretended, he said it was a principle utterly incompatible with social or civil security". Of the expulsion of six Methodist students from the University of Oxford, who "would not desist from publicly praying and exhorting", he said, "Sir, that expulsion was very just and proper"; and when Boswell said that he was told they were very good beings, Johnson replied, "I believe they might be good beings; but they were not fit to be in the University of Oxford. A cow is a very good animal in a field, but we turn her out of a garden." He would have been surprised had he seen that expulsion reversed in the University, and continuing for generations to weaken a worldwide organism which had come to be called the Anglican Communion. Of an "amiable young lady" who left the Church and joined the Quakers, he said to Mrs Knowles, "Madam, she is an odious wench. . . . She knew no more of the Church which she left, and that which she embraced, than she did of the difference between the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems"; and when Mrs Knowles interjected, "She had the New Testament before her", Johnson answered, "Madam, she could not understand the New Testament, the most difficult book in the world, for which the study of a life is required." This, which is Boswell's account of the explosion, is tame beside that composed by Miss Seward;[1] but then the poetic daughter of Lichfield Close does not seem to have been quite at home with this "stupendous" "but dirty stripling" from beyond the Minster Pool, who had been her grandfather's not wholly encomiastic pupil. When a Scottish Presbyterian divine talked before Dr Johnson of fat bishops and drowsy deans, Johnson said to him, "Sir, you know no more of our church than a Hottentot."[2] But we have Miss Seward's word for his saying, "If I had been educated in the Roman Catholic

[1] *J.–B.* (=H. Kingsmill, *Johnson without Boswell*), 205-9.
[2] B., *Hebrides* (Oxford, 1930), 419.

faith, I believe I should have questioned my right to quit the religion of my fathers";[1] and according to Boswell he could say, ". . . I would be a Papist if I could. I have fear enough; but an obstinate rationality prevents me. . . ." He could indeed speak against Roman Catholics: "In everything in which they differ from us, they are wrong." He assured Boswell, however, that he preferred the Popish way to the Presbyterian; upheld "apostolical ordination" as a thing "dangerous to be without"; argued against predestination; declared Purgatory to be "a very harmless doctrine"; defended prayer for the dead; denied that there was idolatry in the Mass ("They believe God to be there, and they adore him"), or that Papists "worship saints", though he thought it "safer not to practise" invocation; and said of Confession, "I don't know but that is a good thing"; but he allowed that in practice abuses had arisen from some of these teachings. All this was before the days of Catholic Emancipation: had Johnson seen a second hierarchy planted over against the hierarchy which he knew and esteemed, he might have apprehended a labefactation of civil and spiritual order.

For order and subordination of degree, both in the great chain of being and in social life, Johnson had a high regard. When Mrs Knowles expressed a hope that in another world the sexes will be equal, he answered, "That is being too ambitious, Madam." In degree he placed the English clergy very high, in virtue of their sacred office. He said of that queer fish George Psalmanazar, whom he reverenced for his piety,[2] that he would as soon think of contradicting him as "of contradicting a BISHOP"; and Mr Seward (perhaps with something of his daughter's artistry), having seen him presented to the Archbishop of York, "described his Bow to an ARCH-BISHOP as such a studied elaboration of homage, such an extension of limb, such a flexion of body, as have seldom or never been equalled." Being invited to dine in Christ Church Hall, Johnson said, "Sir, it is a great thing to dine with the Canons of Christ-Church." "Johnson's profound reverence for the Hierarchy", says Boswell, "made him expect from Bishops the highest degree of decorum. . . . 'There are gradations in conduct,' he said, 'there is morality, decency, propriety. None of these should be violated by a bishop.' " And again, when invited to dine with a bishop in Holy Week, he had a perplexed conscience: "Why, Sir, a Bishop's calling company together in this week is, to use the vulgar phrase, *not the thing*. . . . You must consider, laxity is a bad thing; but preciseness is also a bad thing; and your general character may be more hurt by preciseness than by dining with a Bishop in Passion-Week. . . . You are to consider whether you might not do more harm by lessening the influence of a Bishop's character by your disapprobation in refusing him, than by going to him." Any declension from dignity in a clergyman vexed him. Finding himself "in company with several clergymen who thought that they should appear to advantage by assuming the lax jollity of *men of the*

[1] *J.–B.*, 207.
[2] *P. and M.* (=*Prayer and Meditations*, ed. Savage, 1927), 59.

world . . . he at last said, by no means in a whisper, 'This merriment of parsons is mighty offensive.' " And even Dr Taylor, his oldest school and college friend, whom he declared to be "better acquainted with my *heart* than any man or woman now alive",[1] and who as a prebendary of Westminster "performed the mournful office of reading the burial service for him", did not wholly escape censure. When Boswell went with Johnson to stay with Taylor at Ashbourne he found Dr Taylor in size, figure, countenance and manner "a hearty English Squire, with the parson superinduced", living in some state, which Boswell describes. Johnson said, "Sir, he has a very strong understanding"; but at a subsequent visit Johnson confessed, "Sir, I love him; but I do not love him more; my regard for him does not increase. As it is said in the Apocrypha, 'his talk is of bullocks'. . . . His habits are by no means sufficiently clerical. . . ." This high esteem of the clerical office was based mainly upon the functions of a clergyman as pastor and preacher; but it proceeded in part from his duty as a leader in liturgical worship. When the cheerful Mr Edwards said that he wished he had been a parson and had a good living and lived comfortably instead of practising at law, Johnson said, "Sir, the life of a parson, of a conscientious clergyman is not easy. . . . I would rather have Chancery suits upon my hands than the care of souls. No, Sir, I do not envy a clergyman's life as an easy life, nor do I envy a clergyman who makes it an easy life." He himself appears to have refused an offer of a benefice chiefly because he doubted his own "patience to undergo the fatigue of catechizing and instructing a great number of poor ignorant persons";[2] and when he wrote his character of the Rev. Zachariah Mudge, prebendary of Exeter, who despite his name stands in the *D.N.B.* together with no less than seven of his immediate descendants, and was "idolized in the west, both for his excellence as a preacher and the uniform perfect propriety of his private conduct", it was upon his excellence as a student, a preacher and a companion, "willing to be pleased and easy to please", that he dwelt. But Johnson also took serious account of the clergyman's liturgical duty: in 1780 he wrote a letter to a young clergyman, which opens with advice on reading the liturgy: "You are afraid of falling into some improprieties in the daily service by reading to an audience that requires no exactness. Your fear, I hope, secures you from danger. They who contract absurd habits are such as have no fear. It is impossible to do the same thing very often without some peculiarity of manner: but that manner may be good or bad, and a little care will at least preserve it from being bad: to make it good, there must, I think, be something of natural or casual felicity, which cannot be taught." After this the doctor gives advice on sermons and pastoral work. The immediate pont is that he alludes to the "daily service", and treats its rendering as a matter of importance in the high clerical character.

This instance of Johnson's esteem of the weekday worship of the

[1] Mrs. Piozzi in *J.–B.*, 79. [2] Hawkins in *J.–B.*, 94.

Prayer Book, for which evidently there was provision at St Clement Danes in the late eighteenth century,[1] does not stand alone. In 1772 "he said he went more frequently to church when there were prayers only, than when there was a sermon, as the people required more an example for the one than for the other"; on his birthday in the previous year he recorded, "I have missed church since Easter only two Sundays, both which I hope I have endeavoured to supply by attendance on divine worship in the following week";[2] and a few days later he wrote, "I have gone voluntarily to church on the week day but few times in my life. I think to mend."[3] For the Church service itself he had a profound reverence. When in Scotland, he heard with pleasure that the Presbyterian ministers were abandoning extemporary prayer for prayers carefully prepared, and adds in his *Journey*, "In the variety of mental powers, some must perform extemporary prayer with much imperfection; and in the eagerness and rashness of contradictory opinions, if publick liturgy be left for the private judgment of every Minister, the congregation may often be offended or misled,"[4] a theme elaborated by Boswell on the same occasion. "Whilst confined by his last illness, it was his regular practice to have the church-service read to him by some attentive and friendly Divine. The Rev. Mr Hoole performed this kind office in my presence", says John Nichols, "for the last time, when by his own desire no more than the litany was said; when his responses were in the deep and sonorous voice which Mr Boswell has occasionally noticed, and with the most profound devotion that can be imagined." A few months earlier, in his last visit to Oxford, Johnson had said, "I know of no good prayers but those in the Book of Common Prayer."

Johnson's loyalty to that Book (like the loyalty of many "Prayer-Book Churchmen" before and since) was coloured by interpretation, partly private, partly conventional. He seems to have taken no account of fasts and days of abstinence, save in the one instance of Good Friday and Easter Even, when his fasting was very real indeed.[5] Equally he took no account of festivals other than Easter: his *Rambler* essays for Tuesday, December 25, 1750, and Tuesday, December 24, 1751, though slightly tinged with religion, have no bearing on the Nativity; and in his private papers it appears that his special seasons of recollection were New Year's Day, his own birthday (September 18), sometimes the anniversary of his wife's death (March 28), and of Church feasts only Good Friday to Easter Day. It seemed to Boswell "that there was always something peculiarly mild and placid" about him "upon this holy festival". Johnson observed also every Sunday, with church attendance, a good deal of systematic Bible-reading and avoidance of dining out. (Boswell counted himself highly privileged when allowed at Easter, 1773, to pierce the mystery of Johnson's Sunday dinner at home; and he "found everything in very good order", including a "veal pye", baked

[1] *Cf.* J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life*, 1914, ch. iv. [2] *P. and M.*, 61.
[3] *P. and M.*, 62. [4] J., *Western Islands*, 96; B., *Hebrides*, 407.
[5] *P. and M., passim.*

apparently at a "publick oven" in order not to keep "servants from church to dress dinners".) Johnson was strict, in fact, though not rigid, in sabbatarianism. Sunday, he observed at St Andrews, "should be different from another day. People may walk, but not throw stones at birds. There may be relaxation, but there should be no levity."[1] This odd remark perhaps grows out of an episode recorded by Mrs Thrale, when some bird-catchers were observed at work on Streatham Common on a Sunday, and Johnson opposed the unnecessary scruples of those who in consequence lamented the enormous wickedness of the times.[2] But despite his reverence for Sunday, Johnson seems to have wholly disregarded the order for receiving Communion three times yearly: it was as late as 1781 when he resolved to participate of the Sacrament at least three times a year;[3] and almost all his life he seems, apart from death-bed communions, to have communicated at Easter only. That practice he never varied from his wife's death onward.[4] In June, 1781, at Southill, "it being the first Sunday of the month, the holy sacrament was administered, and [Boswell] staid to partake of it". Johnson said afterwards, "You did right to stay and receive the communion; I had not thought of it." Boswell believed that Johnson did not choose to approach the altar without a previous preparation. And Boswell was undoubtedly right: for the awful reverence with which Johnson approached his annual communion is the most impressive thing in all his private life of kindliness and disputation, of idleness and ailments and prodigious industry.

And indeed, behind the outward conformity, we are permitted to see a deep personal religion, conditioned by the Prayer Book as Johnson understood it. This we can do in the little volume called *Prayers and Meditations*. When Johnson last visited Pembroke College, Oxford, the Master, Dr Adams, asked him to compile or compose a book of prayers for domestic use. At first Johnson was quite overcome by such a request; then he seriously considered it; but the approach of death made it impossible to fulfil. Instead, he gave to the Rev. Dr Strahan, his friend and a son of his friend, the publisher, a quantity of pieces of manuscript, preserved still at Pembroke College, which contained prayers specially composed on various occasions, and some notes and memoranda about his spiritual struggles and resolves. Wisely or unwisely, Strahan published the whole collection. It would not be seemly to quote some of these intimate things even in generalization; and the great passages—the record of Johnson's communion and prayer with the dying Kitty Chambers, for example—are too affecting to be read aloud. But it is proper to notice Johnson's method of approach to his annual communion. He tried to reduce his social activities all through what he called Passion Week. Then on Good Friday he would compose a sort of special collect, summing up the fruit of his preparatory meditations. This, "my prayer", he would repeat more than once at home and in church before communicating; and he would repeat it again afterwards. It is

[1] B., *Hebrides*, 202.
[2] *J.–B.*, 92-3.
[3] *P. and M.*, 112.
[4] *P. and M.*, 110.

also worth noting that on several occasions, as he approached the altar, he "commended", as he calls it: that is he commended to the divine mercy his "*Θ* friends" or "*Θ.Φ*", by which he certainly meant his departed friends, though whether the *Θ* stands for *Θνητοί*, improperly used—a suggestion which angered Macaulay—or for the old obit sign of medieval MSS does not appear. Like Andrewes, he would accompany this commendation with a request for permission to pray so as far as it might be lawful. In addition to these devotions he would repeat several Prayer-Book collects, carefully selected for the occasion, and noted down in his records. Where he stood in the maze of eucharistic doctrine is not plain: clearly his was not the socinianism of Hoadley nor the advanced teaching of his revered William Law. His avoidance of the current manuals of preparation suggests this; but doctrinally he may well be close to the *New Week's Preparation* (1749),[1] though averse from the more effusive side of its devotion to our Lord. It is noticeable that in his prayers phrases like "I am about to commemorate the Passion" are constant, while phrases like "of the benefits . . . I implore participation" are rare. But there is something inspiring about his continual remembrance of the death of Christ and of the benefits which we receive thereby.

Concerning these prayers of his own making, three things are noticeable. In the first place, their matter is very sober in tone; petitions for pardon, for redemption and for the grace of the Holy Spirit to live a good life here and enter eternal happiness hereafter, with the plainest intercession for friends dead or living, comprise their sum; and some people have missed many themes, and in especial the concept of the Vision of God, unifying moral and spiritual endeavour. In the main this reflects Johnson's firm Anglicanism. Dr McAdoo has taught us to see in post-Reformation Anglican piety a tendency to work away from the Christocentric mysticism of St Bernard and the later Middle Ages towards a devotion of scriptural learning, of liturgy and of edification, in which the unifying concept of moral and ascetic theology is less the Vision of God than the Walk in Newness of Life.[2] Johnson's practice as a student of the Bible, as a follower of liturgical worship, and as a seeker after inward and outward holiness, carries the tendency very far. And this, after all, is but the reflection of the man revealed in his published work. *The Vanity of Human Wishes* ends with lines adapted, and richly changed, from Juvenal's:

> *Orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano;*
> *Fortem posce animum mortis terrore carentem*

—lines which themselves sum up the principal fears of Johnson's mind, namely insanity here and a strict judgment hereafter:

> Still raise for good the supplicating voice,
> But leave to heav'n the measure and the choice,
> Safe in his pow'r whose eyes discern afar
> The secret ambush of a specious pray'r. . . .

[1] D. Stone, 506-9.
[2] H. R. McAdoo, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, ch. vi.

> Pour forth thy fervours for a healthful mind,
> Obedient passions, and a will resign'd;
> For love, which scarce collective man can fill;
> For patience sov'reign o'er transmuted ill;
> For faith, that panting for a happier seat,
> Counts death kind Nature's signal of retreat. . . .

If to this list we add the mystery of redemption, which could not be mentioned in a satire, we are here close to the temper of the Private Prayers. The observance of "the measure of the faith", the honesty of the man whose published writing proclaimed his inner conviction but went no further, is vastly impressive.

Then it is impressive to mark the care with which he appears to have composed these simple utterances, in order that they might be fit to be brought before the throne of grace. Here was a man who could write forty-eight of the printed pages of the *Life of Savage* at a sitting, and three columns of the *Gentleman's Magazine* in an hour, and tumbled out sheets of *The Rambler*, seemingly uncorrected, to the printer's boy:[1] a man of whom Miss Beresford, not alone, said, "How he does talk; every sentence is an essay"; and to whom Goldsmith, with great daring and partial truth, said that he could never write fables, in which the creatures must talk naturally, "for if you were to make the little fishes talk, they would talk like WHALES". And yet, apparently, the MSS show by their many erasures that great care was bestowed upon these short prayers,[2] destined to be read by no human eye but his own, solely because they were destined also to be offered to his Maker. Those who are, or think themselves, called upon to produce forms of prayer for special occasions would do well to ponder this example.

Lastly, it is remarkable, when you come to think of it, that these prayers should be in English at all. Some people, including Launcelot Andrewes, write their prayers, if at all, in a learned language: it is some guard against intrusive eyes; and perhaps it gives a sort of cloak of sophistication to cover our self-consciousness. Here was a man who could write sound Latin verse as a recreation after a paralytic stroke, and who in his last days placed over his humble parents' grave a great stone with a long and ponderous epitaph in Latin, unintelligible to most readers and now hidden under a formidable carpet. Here was a man who, having made for Goldsmith the famous *nihil "quod tetigit non ornavit"* epitaph, felt outraged when a round-robin, signed by men like Gibbon and Burke and Reynolds, suggested that such a writer of English as Goldsmith might have an English epitaph, and declared that "he would never consent to disgrace the walls of Westminster Abbey with an English inscription", wondered "that Joe Warton, a scholar by profession, should be such a fool", and said that he " should have thought Mund Burke would have had more sense". And yet in his own prayers he would use neither the Latin in which he excelled nor the "energetick" English

[1] Hawkins in *J.–B.*, 44.
[2] E. Trueblood, *Doctor Johnson's Prayers*, 1949, 24.

that impressed Miss Pinkerton and Miss Jenkyns, but the dignified and simple style of the collects that his mother had taught him. The Great Lexicographer would appear before his Maker, stripped of all the distinctions men revered him for, in the simplicity of his mother tongue, the tongue of the Prayer Book, the true language of prayer for an Englishman. There could be no "specious prayer" before Him "*cui cæca patent penetralia cordis*".

EDWARD SWANSEA AND BRECON.

Evangelism in the Country Parish

"Which things the angels desire to look into" (1 Pet. i, 12).

THE bishop could not have known, as he sat down, that there was an angel in the room. During the desultory applause which followed his lordship's speech on rural evangelism, the unseen reporter sadly looked over his notes.

"This will never do", he murmured. "Quiet days for the clergy . . . evangelization of the congregations first . . . to be followed later by an attempt to reach those who do not come to church. . . . Many good judges think that the revival of religion will come from the rural parishes . . . we live in a day of opportunity . . . respectful applause from the assembled clergy, with forebodings in each man's heart that this would make little change in his own parish. . . .

"I can't present this as a report to the celestial assembly. Cherubim and Seraphim will never believe that this is a fair account of the work of the Eternal King. I must go and see whether this is all that is happening; and if not, I will know."

The next day, about the middle of the afternoon, the angel quietly descended on the rural heart of the diocese, having consulted the dossiers of a few people in his selected parish. The information which the parish priest gains painfully and by pieces, about the history of each individual soul, was available to the angel in the muniment room of heaven. Lighter than the fall of dew at evening on the surrounding moorland was the descent of the angel upon the quiet village. Certainly Mary, who was sunbathing against the south and secluded wall of her father's cottage, never noticed him. Nothing disturbed her modesty; not a blush betrayed the knowledge that her retreat had been surprised. The angel, lost in admiration, surveyed the first subject of his report on rural evangelism. Her physical beauty overwhelmed him.

"His work is worthy to be praised and had in honour", he said softly, with eyes almost blinded by the rising tears of love and adoration.

"Mary M.", he continued, running over in his mind the dossier, and unheard by the girl, whose only thought was how good it was to be out of the shop and in the sunshine on a pleasant afternoon,

"baptized 1930; attended Sunday school from five years old onwards, being encouraged by a devout mother; disposition, quiet; mental equipment, average; confirmed 1944, at church most Sundays, regular communicant; course of life, uneventful; occupation, shop assistant."

This, and a good deal more, he recollected as he stood in silence where nothing was happening.

"This girl", he said, "will marry and have children, whom she will bring up in the fear of God."

And he jotted down in his notebook:

"I have investigated the case of Mary M. She has been held by the Eternal through the Church ever since she was born, and in her the work of evangelism is going on and going well. Through her the Eternal is already preparing the salvation of the next generation."

Then, like some medieval scribe, he embellished his text with a "Glory be to thee, O Lord" in the margin, before he flew off to make his next inquiry.

Jacob Potts, when the angel found him, was looking out to sea. He had experienced that morning, for the first time in his life, a weakness at the knees, of which he had often read, and now found, to his astonishment, to be possible. The woman he loved had refused to marry him. He had been disappointed before, but not in love. A lad of some ability, he had gone to the university, and hoped for a first. He had missed it, and the memory of thwarted pride and ambition was not quickly effaced. Since then he had seen something of the world, and concluded that academic distinction was not, as he had supposed, a necessary passport to wealth and honour. Having lost it, he had managed without it. But now he had lost his heart's desire; and though reason, prudently and half mockingly, suggested that he would survive the loss, he could not imagine that he would ever forget it or survive unchanged. An outraged heart pondered the ways of providence, without submission. The Eternal, if all-powerful, was unjust. Unable to attend to any task, he had gone down to the shore to be alone. The day was calm and the sunlight lay upon the sea in spacious peace. It was some relief to his wounded soul to walk along the fringe of the incoming tide and listen to the "many voices" which, as the poets accurately report, may be heard in the sound of the waves.

"The Eternal does not care", he thought. "The far-stretching sea and sky are his vast work. Lovers come and lovers go, and when we are in the dust and all trace of our sharp grief forgotten, the waves will still come in on this same shore, and the sea will lie in sunlit beauty, as it does now."

It struck the angel that here was an unfinished story and, like a good reporter, he wished to know the whole. For some hours he attended to Jacob in the crisis of his soul. Nor did he feel at liberty to go until there came from the depth of the young man's heart the conviction which for the rest of his life was to be closer to him than a lover.

"Thou alone abidest. As thou art exalted above all change, so be my faith in thee."

"Amen", added the angel, and jotted down as a tail-piece: "How unsearchable are his judgements and his ways past finding out."

To complete his inquiry, the angel decided to look in on the parson, who, because he was poor and kept at home by domestic care, had been unable to go and hear the bishop. It was to his credit that he was found in church. He had just finished his accustomed and lonely evensong when the angel entered. Still on his knees, he had given himself up to melancholy thoughts which are familiar to all poor men and therefore to many clergymen. For many years he had lived beyond his income in an attempt to provide for his family not the luxuries but the necessities of life. He had had to dip into his reserves to provide food and clothing. It was impossible to pay for a holiday. The household furnishings could not be renewed as they wore out. His walls were dilapidated, his carpets torn or thin. He could not find anything toward the education of his children. Domestic help was out of his reach. The increasing burden of work and anxiety had told upon the health of his wife. He felt like a man who was walking in a blizzard and saw no hope of its ceasing. Around him wealth was increasing, and in all his parish he alone, the minister of God, was desperately poor. Day by day, oppressed with heavy facts and heavier thoughts, he brought his burden into the presence of his God. There was nothing else to be done. To improve his lot was not in his power. He had found by experience that only prayer is left to those who hope for no relief.

The angel slipped quietly into church to see, not what the parson was doing about evangelism, but what was being done in him. Each evening, as the man rose from his knees, despair was interlocked in his heart with hope. He did not hope for future relief; he had almost ceased to think of that. The hope consisted in the sense of the divine presence and the conviction that nothing in this world or beyond could deprive him of it. It was a present joy mysteriously living alongside his grief. The greater the weight of his adversity, the more certainly the pressure released the spring which unlocked his hope, just as in a cigarette case when one presses the spring the case flies open. But a light pressure will not do it.

The angel made a note of these facts and prepared his report. It happened that the parish, as he left it, was the subject of a melancholy discussion between the bishop and the rural dean.

"How is Mr A. getting on there?"

"Very poorly, so far as I can see, my lord. The man seems always worried and depressed. I don't think many people attend services. Church life is pretty dead. There's not much to encourage him. I suppose you couldn't offer him the benefice of ——?"

"Oh, dear me, no; that would never do. I don't think he's quite the sort of man to seize an opportunity."

Meanwhile, in the courts of heaven, the angels had assembled to hear the report of their messenger. When he had written it up it was an exhilarating document. There was a breath-taking quality about

the account of Mary and Jacob and the parson which it is impossible to imitate here on earth. As he finished reading it, the spontaneous applause rolled like thunder.

"Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints."

A. C. Scupholme.

The Revival of the Agape: an Experiment in Worship

In a small country parish in Norfolk in Holy Week, 1949, an agape took place as a service in which Anglicans and Methodists met together in corporate worship. A brief account of this experiment may be of interest to any who are considering the place that worship and fellowship are likely to play as the trend towards Christian reunion continues to grow.

Much hard thinking had to be done beforehand and careful preparations made. Could the agape be held for the first time in a quiet way in a single parish? Would the people see the vision of it? Would they rise to it and support it from their hearts? What would the bishop think? Would it have the intended effect of furthering God's purpose? Was it the right thing to do, or were there any good theological or historical reasons why it might be a mistake? It was necessary to weigh all these questions, and in retrospect it seems clearly right to have taken months of trouble to prepare the way, but it must also be said that the miraculous way in which the venture unfolded and the smoothness of the revival were beyond all expectation, and can now only be regarded as supported by the Holy Spirit.

It was necessary to begin by explaining the idea of an agape to the Church Council, and they responded with genuine interest to the proposal, and one started on the road with the knowledge of their approval and support .The Methodist minister was approached and the idea laid before him. We were already on very friendly terms and trusted one another, and his immediate welcome of this idea at once strengthened our relationship. Meanwhile advice had been sought from an eminent Anglican theologian, and also from the best-known liturgiologist in the Church of England, to make sure that one was not starting off on a voyage of careless rhapsody. The circumstances of a funeral brought to this parish, in all its remoteness, a minister (Franz Hilebrandt) who had been a well-known Lutheran pastor and was now a Methodist minister. From the outset he was overjoyed with the idea, and gave every encouragement and not a little help. The reaction of the diocesan bishop was almost too good to be true. The only two bishops consulted prior to the experiment were both willing and eager that the experiment should take place.

The revival of the agape in this parish concerned only two groups of people, so far as church membership was involved, Anglicans and Methodists. As in many parts of the Fen, Methodism was strong, or had been. The relationship between the Established Church and

Nonconformity had not always been easy or charitable. The embers of an old rivalry might easily have been fanned into flame again. But various factors had reduced the likelihood of any such resurgence of pettiness or partisanship. A new relationship of trust and occasional co-operation had prepared the way for the agape, and largely explains how it is that no obstacle was met locally. Nevertheless, something more was needed to carry the relationship further and to break the remaining elements of prejudice and suspicion.

But throughout the months of preparation one had in mind, not just the local situation of Methodists and Anglicans, but the picture of all Christendom, and this embraced the great Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches. For this reason it was thought desirable to consult Archbishop Germanos, the official head of the Orthodox church in this country. We shall always be grateful for his advice and encouragement; we knew that he spoke with mature judgment and as one of the Presidents of the World Council of Churches. He gave us an account of the agape as it is in the Orthodox Church and of its relation to the Liturgy. The bread which is presented to the priest for use is divided into nine squares. This is first "blessed". The centre square of the bread is then removed and is later used as the consecrated element for Holy Communion. The rest is broken up for the token meal, which constitutes the agape. This may also be regarded as a relic of the custom whereby the wealthier Christians supported the poorer members of the congregation, and the spiritual principle that much is to be expected of those to whom much has been given. The Archbishop seemed pleased to think that the agape might find its way into the Church of England and establish a link with the time-honoured Methodist love-feast, and so at the same time be the means of bringing together the two communions in one great act of Christian worship. With a view to keeping as close as possible to ancient practice, it was decided to accept the Archbishop's suggestion of using Psalm cxlv in the agape service and also one or two of the ancient prayers of the Eastern Church. In this way the agape contained elements of all the great Christian traditions, and here was a place, at least in simple worship, where all the six great groupings of the Church of God (Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Lesser Eastern, Reformed, Anglican, and Independent) could discover some point of unity in the recovery of a neglected fellowship-meal.

Some will say that the agape was never intended to be so liturgical a service. That may be true. But to have the agape within the framework of a service gave it a dignity and helped to declare its character.

It took place on Maundy Thursday, April 14, 1949, at six o'clock in the evening, soon after the farmers and their men had come in from the land in readiness for Good Friday and Easter. The service was held in the daughter church in the parish of Hilgay, in the church of St Mark in the hamlet of Ten Mile Bank. The seating capacity of the church cannot be much more than eighty, and the church was nearly full. The order of service was printed, and it was clearly stated that the service incorporated "a fellowship-meal, following the ancient and historical Christian practice and tradition".

The service began with the hymn "The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord". Then came the opening versicles and responses, "O Lord, open Thou our lips" to "The Lord's name be praised"; then Psalm cxlv, the same psalm which is used by the Eastern Orthodox Church in their agape service. This was followed by the lesson, John xvii, our Lord's high-priestly prayer with its theme of unity, and this was read by the Methodist minister. After the next hymn, "There is a green hill far away", came the sermon. The Methodist minister and Anglican rector had each prepared their congregations for this venture of faith, had stressed the need for unity, and given the people the background of the agape. They had also agreed to make it perfectly clear to the people that the true sacrament of unity was the Holy Communion, but that until the barriers were lifted the agape was the nearest permissible approach to that perfect unity in worship. Taking the illustration of the Emmaus meal, it was possible to give some idea of the development of such a fellowship meal as the agape from the simple example of our Lord's action. The grace which He said was in all probability the words "Blessed art thou, O Lord, God of the Universe, who dost bring forth bread from the earth. Amen". Never was the need for unity more urgent, and this service was offered as a symbol of the future hope that all might be gathered into the unity of the one great Church Universal. Then came the hymn "When I survey the wondrous Cross", after which the congregation recited together the words of the Nicene Creed, again in accordance with primitive and Eastern practice.

Now came the agape itself. First the prayers and blessing of the bread, then the breaking of the bread at the communion rails in face of the congregation. The bread was put in small pieces on two silver salvers which could be conveniently handed along the pews. A small table had been put just inside the communion rails of this small church. During the singing of the hymn before the agape one lay representative of each church had come forward to the rails, an Anglican churchwarden and a Methodist local preacher (both among the most respected men in the local community). When the bread had been broken and handed to these two distributors, together we all said the Lord's prayer. It was like grace before a meal, and nothing can convey the sense of perfect unity at that moment of grace. As the bread was handed down the pews each person present took a piece and sat down to eat it. The Methodist minister and Anglican rector had both helped to break it up in readiness for distribution, and had given a piece each to the other. A short voluntary on the organ was played until all had partaken, then we knelt for prayer. A prayer from Didache ix ("We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus, Thy servant. Glory be to Thee for ever. As this bread that is broken was scattered in many places, and yet gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom, for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus, our Lord"), also the Good Friday collect

("Almighty God, we beseech Thee graciously to behold this Thy family . . ."), together with a brief extempore prayer (for the purpose of including an element of the reformed or Free Church tradition), summed up our thoughts in prayer. The two Orthodox prayers which are part of the Eastern agape service, and one of which was used at Hilgay, are as follows: "Blessed be God, who is merciful, and who nourisheth us from our youth up, who is the Author of all sustenance. Fill our hearts with joyfulness, that in Thy bountiful providence we may serve Thee in every good work, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all glory and power, honour and worship, both now and for evermore"; and: "Glory be to Thee, O Lord. Glory be to Thee, O King, because Thou hast given us food for our delight. Fill us also with the Holy Spirit, that we may be acceptable unto Thee, and not be as ashamed when Thou comest to render to every man according to his works."

The service then ended with the triumphant hymn "Jesus shall reign" and the traditional blessing.

There was a natural family atmosphere about the service. Some may think that this came from the smallness of the community, but we believe it to have been something more sacred than personal acquaintance. Unity in worship had proved a means of grace, and the agape had been an expression of that ultimate harmony and total reconciliation for which all mankind for ever yearns, and fails to realize.

The two conditions required of all who partook of the agape were that they should have been baptized and that they "loved the Lord in sincerity and truth"—the sacrament of baptism, and some guarantee of personal discipleship. No use was made either of the communion vessels or of any of the words of the Holy Communion service, nor was anything done symbolically that might have led to any misinterpretation or confusing of issues. Rather has a new spirit of trust and co-operation and mutual witness been generated, and much of the old spirit of obstructive rivalry or mistrust has been exploded. It is not suggested that a service like this should be held often: indeed, it seems sufficient to have it at most once a year. It witnesses to a fundamental unity. At the next agape the Methodists should be the hosts and the Anglicans the guests. Would that the day could come when the exchange of invitation might be between Lutheran and Orthodox, Coptic and Roman Catholic, Calvinist and Quaker, Armenian and Presbyterian, and so on, until the interchange of worship has woven such a texture of new-found grace and goodwill that the barriers of isolation have sunk deep into the ground, and God has given us a new vision of the meaning of the unity He meant.

There probably ought never to be any one rigid set form for the agape. It is essentially an expression of fellowship between man and man and man and God, discovered in the breaking of bread, and this expression is bound to be influenced by variations of insight and need and local conditions in different parts of the world. It

would be a great mistake to try to stereotype it. The agape has been described as a "New Testament service", and this is true. It has been described in this account as simply a fellowship-meal, an expression of something far greater than itself, a means of grace.

IAN THOMSON.

A Traveller Writes Home[1]

Dr Angelo Crespi, before his retirement a few years ago lecturer in Italian Studies at Birkbeck College, London, was born in Milan and brought up in a Catholic home of genuine if narrow piety, removed from those currents of scientific inquiry which towards the end of the nineteenth century seemed to the rising generation to be sweeping away so much. Such studies, however, drew him when he passed from school to the University of Pavia and led to a temporary break with Catholicism.

> From the age of thirteen, he tells us, partly in reaction from restrictions at home, partly under the influence of masters and friends and, as time went on, of contemporary culture, the writer departed further and further from the faith of his parents, influenced not a little by the positivism of the circles in which he moved, especially during the years devoted to the study of natural science at the University, though he never went all the way to positivism.

But there followed more years of study at Genoa, where he took his doctorate in philosophy, and here he enjoyed the friendship of two *Mazziniani*, Giacinto Minesi and Ermengildo Castiglione, who roused in him an enduring interest in social and political questions, led him to that study of history which was to absorb him in later years, and, both deeply religious, though on the fringes of orthodox Catholicism as conceived in the home circle, somehow made the scientific positivism of his earlier years look thin.

They also awakened in him an interest in England, so that he welcomed an opportunity which offered in 1904 to become the London correspondent of two Italian papers, and plunged ever more eagerly into the study of our life and literature and the task of interpreting what was happening in this country to his own people. He discovered with interest the very different course which neo-Hegelianism had taken in this country, under the influence of T. H. Green, Edward Caird, F. H. Bradley and others, and in his own. To live in intimate contact with those brought up in a different tradition, speaking a different language, and taking quite different things for granted, is, for one imbued in his own culture, and for a mind of the quality of Dr Crespi's, an invigorating and challenging experience. He was impressed by the tradition of liberty which he found here. To the young man it almost seemed that the ideals of Mazzini were here realized, and his last years were to be exhilarated as he saw the spirit which met the Armada come to life again and

[1] *Dall' io a Dio*. By Angelo Crespi. Guanda.

refuse to admit defeat. Increasingly, too, he became aware of the religious roots of our liberty.

> Behind the heroic, solitary British resistance of 1940-41 there is the whole historic development which made the Middle Ages in England more favourable than anywhere else to the growth of all the freedoms, and which led at the beginning of modern times to that direct return to the Judeo-Christian tradition, without the intrusion of classical culture, which caused the aspiration of Israel, the most freedom-loving people of antiquity, to become, for three centuries and more, the inspiration of the moral, social and political education of the most freedom-loving people of the modern world.

We who have grown up in this tradition, and are conscious rather of the many ways in which it is menaced, find the respect and enthusiasm of those who come from elsewhere to share our life a little surprising. In England, he tells his compatriots, there entered into the common life those strivings after perfection which elsewhere the Church, engaged in its own quite cynical *Realpolitik*, had successfully cloistered. The English realized that it was the business of the state to protect liberty.

> The essential originality of the Puritan revolution, with its remote obligations to the radical branch of Franciscanism, from which springs the characteristic Anglo-Saxon conception of the state, and of the relation between society and the state, lies in its belief that it is the right and duty of each one of us to live in accordance with his conscience as illuminated by direct contact with God. The state exists above all to this end.

Increasingly, however, as time went on, this was not the sort of thing that was expected in Italy of a London correspondent, and if Crespi was destined to spend the rest of his life in England it was because, after 1922, he was virtually an exile, anything but *persona grata* to the rulers of Italy, a name hardly to be mentioned behind closed doors or in private correspondence.

Two years after his arrival here his journalistic work brought to him what to his life's end he regarded as the most enriching of all his early contacts, his friendship with Baron von Hügel, then one of the leaders of the Modernist movement, which was at that time approaching its crisis. This was in 1906, two years before the publication of *The Mystical Element in Religion*, that great study in the philosophy of religion to which this book owes so much, and which reveals, to those concerned to inquire, why von Hügel drew back when the full wrath of the Vatican fell on so many of his friends, and remained, in spite of everything, a loyal son of the Church. Crespi too was to remain a practising Catholic, but without illusions.

> This was the beginning of an increasingly intimate friendship of over eighteen years' duration, the fruit of which was a convincing and persistent awareness of the value of personality, as a source of our knowledge of reality. The personality of Friedrich von Hügel, far more even than his writings, proved, especially after his death, so thought-provoking as to solve for the writer the problems which were raised for him by the ambiguity of the Hegelian and neo-Hegelian philosophy of religion, and by the difference between Anglo-American and Italian neo-Hegelianism.

The two, the eager young journalist and his older friend, used to walk together in Kensington Gardens discussing events and books and people and "above all, the problems of philosophy and religion". If his first impression of the great man was unforgettable, it was continually deepened as the years went by and he came to know

> his vast and assimilated learning, his sincere and simple piety and the conviction which he inspired that his roots were immersed in the living and life-giving waters of divine reality. Before such a monumental personality others too found that God became more real to them.

On January 27, 1925, a great company of the friends of von Hügel gathered in the Carmelite church in Kensington, frequented by the master for many years, for a last farewell. Catholics, Anglicans, Nonconformists, Jews, Hindus, Moslems, Unitarians, Agnostics, were united in thanksgiving, and many came away with a sense of having learned that which it was incumbent upon them to pass on.

It was then that this work was conceived, in the hope of doing for Italians, *mutatis mutandis*, something of what von Hügel had done for his readers in this country. Under the pressure of war conditions, and the awareness which they brought of the precariousness of existence, the author succeeded in giving it some sort of form by 1940. He had to finish it. As Dante loved and hated his native Florence, so he loved and hated the Catholic Church, and he feared that a literary executor would inevitably weaken a tension which must be there. By 1945, twenty years after its inception, it was revised and finished. The preface, "perhaps the best thing he ever wrote", says Duke Gallarati Scotti in his brief, delightful introduction, is dated December, 1948. He died on January 30, 1949.

To say that he is indebted to von Hügel would be an understatement. Von Hügel is little known in Italy and there is room for an introduction to his thought, yet the book is very much more than this. It is a frontal attack on unbelief by one who has been there and come back by a long, slow, difficult route: an affirmation of the initiative of God, and a search for a broadly based philosophy of history. Our age of specialization, it is often said, is in need of a new *Summa*. Dr Crespi would not claim to be another St Thomas. With his fastidious scholarship he is too well aware of the dangers of such an aspiration; the too facile generalizations which appeal to a limited knowledge and are liable to be disallowed, each in his own sphere, by those who know their stuff. But he tries to see the wood as well as the trees and would have wished his work to be taken seriously as a contribution to a prophetic synthesis of knowledge for the significant times in which we live.

> A philosophy of history has in a way again become possible . . . and history is for us today, as for the prophets of Israel, for St Paul, St Augustine, Joachim of Fiore, the plane where God speaks and man listens, where eternal life begins . . . where man makes his decision and God passes judgement. God has his word for us, and it is our business to listen and obey.

The book covers a wide range and is a work of great learning. The starting-point is the disillusionment expressed, in 1872, by De

Sanctis, in an essay, well known in Italy, concerning the value of secular culture as a source of national greatness. Then, as in the days of Guicciardini, what was regarded as the very essence of civilization proved impotent to maintain civilization; indeed, it brought about its decadence. It is very far from being the case that knowledge, in itself, is power. The real qualities of greatness turned out to be something given, which refinement of culture might enhance but could not create. Moral greatness in fact, though De Sanctis did not see this, comes from God. The task is to show not only, historically, that this is so, but, philosophically, that it must be so.

The first part of the book accordingly is epistemological. We are shown how Descartes gave the wrong answer to the dilemma which confronted medieval philosophy, and how the right answer is to be found in Kant, though Kant himself failed to make it sufficiently explicit, and his followers ignored the conclusion which he all but reached.

> Reduced to consistency with himself Kant would seem to approach a sort of Leibnizian realism of monads. Monads open towards one another by the very fact of being open towards a God who is at once transcendent and immanent and who reveals himself supremely in and to the moral consciousness.

Our knowledge, at all its varied levels, is knowledge of reality, and is not less but more real as we pass from the abstractions of mathematics to the particularity of objects, living things and persons.

> For nothing can be experienced by us as *other* more certainly than another will, whether one which resists ours, or, even more, one which we recognize as giving us, freely and undeservedly, what is beyond our reach, or forgiving us that for which we can never forgive ourselves.

The most concrete of all realities is God, but we must not expect our idea of God to be clear and distinct. Such an expectation is a mark of spiritual adolescence, whether of the individual or of the age to which he belongs. "Only God can have clear and distinct knowledge of himself." Our knowledge of God comes to us by means of persons, the best we know in our personal experience, as well as the great creative, religious personalities of history, the *theophoric* personalities, which inspire every form of religion. But all these bear witness to God's method of self-revelation, and of this the Incarnation, unique though it is, is the supreme instance.

Epistemology leads to metaphysics, metaphysics to theology, and theology is the stuff of which history is made. And here the heart of the matter is what von Hügel used to call the prevenience of God. "We love him because he first loved us", or, in the words of Dante he is *L'amore che è primo ad amare*. What matters is our response to that love. We need to be freed from solipsism and immanentism not only because they are philosophically unsound but because they obstruct grace, contribute to self-love, and weaken that true liberty which is not autonomy but *theonomy*, the self-realization which

comes through self-abandonment, communion with God and consecration to his purposes *hic et nunc et ultra*.

Besides his great debt to von Hügel, Dr Crespi's philosophical associations are with A. J. Toynbee, A. E. Taylor, C. C. J. Webb and others among English writers, and with Kierkegaard, Troeltsch and Buber. He dissociates himself from Fichte, Feuerbach, Marx, Nietzsche, Croce and Gentile. It is to be hoped that this thoughtful and suggestive book will be widely read by those for whom it is intended. In this country some of the thought will be more familiar than in Italy, and the Italian neo-Hegelianism against which much of it is directed perhaps less familiar, but its depth and warmth and learning, its devotional appeal, the sanity and soundness and courage of its main contentions, even when the specialists have done their worst (and disagreement over details there is bound to be in a work of this scope), the lucidity of style and thought, the felicity of the treatment of one theme after another, and, perhaps above all, the joyful confidence that, in spite of everything, evil and suffering are with us because without them this world would also miss good things which pass all understanding, encourage the hope that this "testament" may be made accessible to readers in the country which the author so greatly admired, and in which he struck such deep roots. May light perpetual shine upon him in the fuller life to which he has gone.

MABEL BURDESS.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. C. Scupholme is Rector of Thurcaston, Leicester.

The Rev. Ian Thomson is Rector of Hilgay, Norfolk.

Mrs Burdess is a Lecturer at Edge Hill Training College, Ormskirk.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE GAZE OF GOD

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In his article on Nicholas of Cusa's *De visione Dei* Mr Cowley, speculating on where Nicholas got the novel idea of the gaze of God from, suggests that "in his various contacts with the Eastern Church he would have seen their superb icons". He would not in fact, of course, have needed to go so far afield: St Mark's, Venice, had, and has, as splendid a display of Byzantine mosaic iconography as is to be seen anywhere.

But I would like to suggest that there is more to the question than this. Otto Demus in his *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration* stresses the fact that the Byzantine iconographical practice rested on a very firm theoretical, in fact philosophical, foundation. The idea of the essen-

tial relation between the prototype and the image is most clearly expounded by Theodore of Studium and John of Damascus: they differ in essence but are identical in meaning, and worship directed to the image is passed on to the prototype. This neo-Platonic theory was directly translated into practice, and I suggest that it was this same theory which underlay the *De visione Dei*.

Concerning the magical identity of prototype and image Nicholas writes: "There is nothing which seemeth proper to the gaze of the icon of God which doth not more really exist in the veritable gaze of God Himself" (*E.T.*, p. 7). It followed from this in Byzantine iconographical theory both that the icons themselves were worthy of veneration and that, when observed with due veneration, they communicated to the worshipper their attributes; this idea, too, is echoed by Nicholas in several passages, *e.g.*: "Thy gaze is that supreme goodness which cannot fail to communicate itself to all able to receive it—the capacity which maketh union possible is naught else save likeness" (p. 16); this likeness is achieved "when I look unto Thee alone with all my attention". Here and in similar passages Nicholas is surely transposing the Byzantine insistence on the frontality of the image; indeed, he devotes a whole chapter to the subject "of seeing face to face".

Demus goes so far as to suggest that pilgrimages were unpopular in Byzantine countries because it was possible to undertake a spiritual pilgrimage round the Church under the all-seeing eye of the Pantokrator; in the *De visione* we read: "Thou, Lord, art the companion of my pilgrimage. Wheresoever I go Thine eyes are always upon me!" (p. 21). Finally, Mr Cowley stresses the emphasis on the Incarnation, to which, indeed, the last third of the work is devoted. It is, perhaps, not fanciful to remember that this emphasis is also to be found in the great schemes of mosaic decoration, for directly below the central figure in the dome the main events of His incarnate life are invariably represented. In view of all this I suggest that in his *De visione Dei* Nicholas was, consciously or unconsciously, translating twelfth-century Byzantine iconographical theory into terms of mystical theology.

Yours faithfully,
BARRY TILL.

WESTCOTT HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.

"THE CONCEPT OF MIND"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May a layman suggest that Canon T. R. Milford in his article in the August THEOLOGY on Professor Gilbert Ryle's book *The Concept of Mind* misses the importance of a conception that may change the habit of Christendom.

The change can be illustrated perhaps by referring to Stanley Spencer's Resurrection paintings shown recently at the Royal

Academy. For this artist seems to share Professor Ryle's views about human beings. He paints with gross emphasis the bodies of people and their behaviour, and there is no sign of "soulfulness". We see him insisting that the important thing about a human being is not the "soul" that, to use Canon Milford's words, "is moved by 'a sunset touch, a chorus ending from Euripides' or from the B minor Mass"; the important thing to Spencer is the creature who yawns, or works, or sits in his shirt-sleeves, the creature as known in his dress and behaviour by his family and friends.

Spencer, however, goes further than Professor Ryle, because he places this matter-of-fact conception of human beings in a Christian doctrine, namely that of the Resurrection, thereby implying that all these bodies and their behaviour are important to God. As George Macdonald has written, "the appearances of nature are the truths of nature. . . . The show of things is that for which God cares *most*. . . . The body of man does not exist for the sake of its hidden secrets; its hidden secrets exist for the sake of its outside—for the face and the form in which dwells revelation: its outside is the deepest of it."[1]

To quote Canon Milford again, it surely is not merely "providential that the Creed does not speak of the immortality of the soul, but of the resurrection of the body." The latter is a basic belief coming from the Apostles themselves—it was not our Lord's "soul" that appeared to them, it was his body. We need not believe that the actual atoms of our bodies are resurrected (they are in any case continually changing during our lifetime), but we can readily believe that the *form* of our bodies (if worthy) might be resurrected.

Could the pages of THEOLOGY show, not the retreat that Canon Milford seems to make, an admission that "the ghost in the machine" is perhaps in man really more ghostly than had been formerly supposed, but show some acknowledgment that in his exposition and destruction of the ghost Professor Ryle has done a great service to Christendom?

GILBERT WALTON.

ABINGDON, BERKS.

BAPTISM AND CIRCUMCISION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

While agreeing with Dr Martin that the argument from Circumcision on the eighth day in the Old Covenant to Infant Baptism in the New is one for which the New Testament writers offer no support, it seems to me that he goes to far when he says: "There is no true analogy at any point between baptism and circumcision, and the New Testament gives no hint that the one has taken the place of the other. Circumcision was one thing and baptism is quite another" (p. 303).

[1] C. S. Lewis's *Anthology* (Bles), p. 69.

If the Jews believed that their children entered the covenant through circumcision (see, *e.g.*, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 108 f.), and the Christians that faith and baptism were the means of initiation into the new covenant, one would expect a comparison between the two rites to have been made at some time.

Surely this is to be found in Col. ii, 8-15. The Christians have received the circumcision not made with hands, the circumcision which Christ gives, in "the putting off of the body of the flesh", when they were buried with Him in baptism, and also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. "Putting off"—*ἀπέκδυσις*—is a baptism word; *cf.* Selwyn, 1 *Peter*, p. 324. Paul does not make a separation between the state of mind of the person baptized and the act of baptism which embodies it.

Again, is it not perhaps misleading to say that Col. ii is "the only passage in the New Testament where circumcision and baptism are mentioned together"? Paul speaks of circumcision as a "seal" (Rom. iv, 11), and there is evidence that this was a Jewish term for the rite (see Sanday and Headlam, p. 107). May it not be that when the Christians use the metaphor of "sealing" they are comparing Christian initiation with Jewish circumcision (2 Cor. i, 22; Eph. i, 13; Eph. iv, 30; Rev. vii. 3, etc.)?

Circumcised Jews were baptized because the type (circumcision) is not sufficient now that the new covenant has been made. I am not sure what is the evidence that "apparently Christian Jews were encouraged by the apostles to continue the practice of circumcising their children", but even if this was so, as perhaps it was, the reason for it may have been expediency; and this seems to have been the explanation of the circumcision of Timothy, since the author of Acts (xvi, 3) says it was "because of the Jews that were in those parts."

With regard to the statement that "there is no hint in the whole discussion [with the Judaizers] of any connexion between circumcision and baptism", this is not quite accurate. Paul says that the distinction between Jew and Greek has been overcome in Christ, because they have been baptized into Christ (Gal iii. 27 f.). The new rite has fulfilled and superseded the old.

I may add that this view is also held by Mr. W. F. Flemington in *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (1948), *e.g.* p. 62: "What circumcision meant under the Old Dispensation, that, and no less, is the meaning of baptism for those living in the New Age."

Yours faithfully,

J. C. Fenton.

Lincoln Theological College.

THE MOTHER OF GOD

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In his article on the book *The Mother of God* in your April number Mr B. S. Moss raised a point which has, I think, hardly

received adequate attention in the subsequent correspondence. It is, as he says, most important to remember that the relationship both of Christ and of Christians to the Blessed Virgin is an "adult-mother" relationship and that there is nothing infantile or adolescent about it, in the pejorative sense of those words; it was one of my main purposes in the essay which I contributed to the book to make this clear and to set devotion to Mary upon the firm theological foundations of the permanence of Christ's manhood in his ascended glory and of our real incorporation into Him. Mr Moss seems to conclude, however, that the consequence of this is that our relationship to Mary is less intimate and real than an infantile or adolescent relationship would be; he describes her, for example, as *mater emerita*, a phrase which, from the common associations of the word *emeritus* (as in "professor emeritus", "archdeacon emeritus" and so on), would certainly seem to carry the implications of retirement from office. I find it difficult to follow him here. Nor do I think that his introduction of the word "dependence" (for it is his word and not mine) has clarified the matter. There are, after all, a great many kinds of dependence and it does not seem helpful to restrict the use of the word to the conditions of infancy and adolescence. What worries me about the attitude of many Anglicans to the Blessed Virgin is their assumption that Christians have no real relationship to her at all, for this seems to me to spring from an all too common monophysite doctrine about the ascended Christ, a view which explicitly or implicitly holds that He ceased to be truly man after His ascension. In any case, the milieu in which a really infantile attitude to Mary is to be found is that of a certain type of moderate Anglicanism, in which Mary is almost entirely confined to the children's corner, is depicted solely as the mother of the infant Jesus, and is accompanied by sentimental representations of small furry animals. But nothing infantile is suggested by the figure of the Queen of heaven.

I am far from denying that a good deal of devotion to our Lady has been unbalanced and misdirected; it was for this reason that I based my discussion of Mariology upon the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. It is, I think, unfortunate that the correspondence has not paid more attention to this fact and has tended to discuss points that are logically secondary. What I should like to see, because it would be most useful, would be a theological discussion of the fundamentals (not the incidentals) of Mariology from the Protestant point of view; this would, I believe, help to lay bare the basic differences between Catholics and Protestants about the nature of grace and our relation to Christ. But, as was found in planning the conference at which the papers published in *The Mother of God* were read, it is extraordinarily difficult to get anyone who does not belong to the "Catholic" school of thought to discuss Mariology constructively at all. Is it perhaps true, as Dr Florovsky asserted in his paper, that Protestant theologians simply have nothing to say about Mary?

There is one further reflection which is perhaps of some importance. Anti-Roman controversialists have made a good deal of use—

and not always overscrupulously—of the Eastern Orthodox Church as a stick with which to beat Rome. It would not be true to say that there are no differences between Rome and the East about Mariology, but those differences are very small compared with the differences between Rome and the East on the one hand and low-church and central Anglicanism on the other. If we are really prepared to line up with the Eastern Church, we shall have to take our Lady a good deal more seriously than Anglicans have usually taken her in the past.

Yours sincerely,
E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

THE HOUSE CHURCH AND THE FRENCH CHURCH

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Much that Dr Robinson has to say in his article "The House Church and the Parish Church" is stimulating and even exciting; it is therefore a pity that he has had to distort the true significance of "the kind of thing that is being reborn, this time outside the parish Church, in the movement of the Spirit described in *France Pagan?*" The Spirit behind the new movements in the French Church, which have resulted in the Mass being taken into the very centre of the pagan milieu, is not that of a chameleon changing its colour to suit its environment, but rather that of a serum being injected into a sick organism. It is precisely because of the firm conviction, born of personal experience, that the Mass *de facto* can speak to the working folk clustered round the priest in the little room that it is said there at all. The flowers, "real flowers from a florist", the "careful but heavy genuflections", the vestments *and* the sacred vessels, all these have a real and essential part to play, and are not subject to any modification. Dr Robinson has completely missed the point of the new movements in France specifically relating to this matter if he sees the Mass entering the private home as a question of the absorption of the Church's perpetual offering to God by the "everyday soil-stained world". It is, in fact, a consecration by the Church of the world in which it finds itself. The Church of France gives thanks for its discovery that the Low Mass, as it has evolved under the guidance of the Holy Ghost down through the ages, has something to offer the contemporary proletariat in its demonstration on the liturgical plane of the rhythm, colour, and drama with which the modern worker feels at home.

Yours faithfully,
David Watmough.

43, Cheyne Avenue,
South Woodford.

BOOK REVIEWS

EARLY CHRISTIAN CREEDS. By J. N. D. Kelly. Longmans. 26s.

This is a book for which students of the history of the creeds have long been waiting. It is the first full-scale treatment of the subject in English since the well-known works of Dr Burn and Dr Badcock, and the time has now come to gather up and assess the value of their work in the light of more recent research. Mr Kelly's book exhibits not only extensive research and wide knowledge of modern discussions, but also independent judgment and studious fairness in assessing the merits and defects in the various solutions of the problems involved.

The great merit of the book is that its treatment of the evolution of credal forms and their place in Christian worship really seems to make sense of the various features in the evidence (both patristic and liturgical) which is available.

It is only possible here to select some of the salient features of the work.

In his criticism of the traditional views (expressed, for example, by Dr Burn in England and Kattenbusch in Germany) Mr Kelly holds that they have prematurely assumed the existence of fixed credal formularies. Owing to the fluid and fluctuating forms in which early patristic writers express their faith or "rule of faith" (*e.g.*, Tertullian) he finds in their evidence no ground for assuming the existence of a fixed stereotyped creed. The earliest rites of baptism contain only short interrogative creeds with a somewhat expanded Christological clause. The crystallization of such creed-like summaries found in early writers was due to (1) the baptismal confession; (2) catechetical instruction; (3) the liturgy, which in its eucharistic prayer tended to assume a creed-like form.

There were, he maintains, at Rome early in the third century semi-official forms rather than a single authoritative form. Declaratory creeds (as opposed to the interrogative creeds at baptism) had no currency in the second or early third century. The rise of such declaratory creeds he associates with the development of the catechumenate and coincided with the appearance in the third century of the *disciplina arcani* which forbade the publication of the creed to others than the baptized or those immediately preparing for baptism. It was in the West that the formal delivery of the creed to candidates for baptism and its recitation by them, before the actual rite of baptism, first appears.

Mr Kelly marks a return to traditional views in accepting the time-honoured contention of Archbishop Ussher that we can reconstruct the old Roman Creed in the fourth century from the evidence of Rufinus and Marcellus of Ancyra, and he has a devastating criticism "Constantinopolitan" creed (C) was based on that of Cyril of the old Roman creed (R.) into the later form of the Apostles' Creed as we know it (T.) leads to an interesting and, to many readers, novel view of the origin of T. Its source is found in South-West

Gaul, and the "Gallicanization" of the Roman rite he regards as "a by-product" of the large-scale permeation of Roman service books under German influence after the beginning of the tenth century, when German influence was strong in Rome. (Is not "ninth" century, p. 434. a slip in view of what is said on p. 432?)

Two other departures from widely accepted views are (1) the rejection of the view of Hort and Harnack that the Nicene Creed was based on the creed of Cæsarea, and (2) Hort's view that the "Constantinopolitan" creed (C) was based on that of Cyril of Jerusalem. Both problems are thoroughly discussed, and the "meagre conclusion" is reached that in the case of (1) we cannot go beyond the use of some local creed of Syro-Palestinian provenance, and in (2) that in the search for its background "we are not likely to emerge from the realm of imagination and guesswork". The object of the Council of 381 was to restore and promote the Nicene faith, and in an extended statement of its teaching the Council availed itself of C. as in harmony with the Nicene faith and in form better fitted to deal with current heresies.

Such are some leading features of this excellent book, which will prove a standard work for future students.

A few minor criticisms may be offered. On p. 37 Ambrose, *de Mysteriis* is described as "slightly earlier" than *de Sacramentis*. The more recent conclusion of Dom Connolly, expanding an earlier article of Dom Morin, is that *de Mysteriis* is really based on *de Sacramentis*, the latter containing the actual spoken addresses of Ambrose taken down by a *notarius*, which Ambrose afterwards embodied in a short formal treatise. An edition of *de Sacramentis* on these lines has recently been published by S.P.C.K. On p. 89 in the discussion of the Der Balyzeh palimpsest fuller use might have been made of Dom Capelle's comments in the 1949 edition (with facsimile by C. H. Roberts), which show (1) that it is really a Euchologion, a collection of prayers of various dates and different origin; (2) that the creed is part of a baptismal rite and is preceded by a considerable lacuna in the manuscript.

J. H. Srawley.

Lincoln.

From Constantine to Julian: A History of the Early Church. Volume III. By Hans Lietzmann. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

Early Church historians have long awaited the publication of this volume—the third in the translation of the late Professor Lietzmann's well-known history, undertaken by Dr Lee Woolf and now published by the Lutterworth Press. The first two volumes have recently been reissued by this publishing house, with a revised translation; in their corrected form they are warmly to be welcomed. The present volume under review has not previously appeared in an English translation. If it raises doubts in the mind, these are not occasioned by the story as Lietzmann tells it.

First, we have a preliminary chapter on the political and economic crisis of the Roman Empire in the third century, with a short outline of contemporary pagan culture as represented by Plotinus, Porphyry, the Chaldean Oracles, and the Hermetic writings. The stage being set, the following chapters trace the development of the story of the Church from the persecution of Diocletian to the death in battle of Julian the Apostate. It is natural that in the telling of the Arian controversy the work of the late Eduard Schwartz (to whom the German original was dedicated) should lie at the foundation. Many of Schwartz's judgments are here summarized. It is good, for example, that the Council of Sardica is here dated in 342 and not in 343. For the correctness of the earlier date, originally proposed by Schwartz in 1904 and accepted without discussion in this volume, has recently been vindicated by the document unearthed by Dr W. Telfer and published earlier this year ("Paul of Constantinople", in *Harvard Theological Review*, XLIII, 1, January 1950, pp. 31-92). Schwartz could not be right all the time (Lietzmann accepts from him the opinion that there was a second council of Nicæa in 327, which is a matter of some scruple and doubtfulness). But his view of the Arian controversy, as an affair in which power politics between the great sees played a by no means inconsiderable part, is lucidly and attractively presented. Lietzmann also writes admirable thumb-nail sketches of the chief personalities—Athanasius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Hilary of Poitiers, and many others. And lest we should think that the entire concern of the Church at that time was the rather sordid theme of ecclesiastical politics, the last chapter on Worship tells us something of the spiritual life of the Church; it is of special value in that it gives a good summary of the present position in respect of such vexed questions as the origin and meaning of the great festivals, Christmas and Epiphany, both of which began to be generally observed in the fourth century.

The German original was first published in 1938 and needs no commendation. It is well known as a masterly sketch of the controversy. Need a reviewer say more than *Tolle, lege*? Here, we might hope, is the book for which we have been waiting, a book to put into the hands of all students wrestling with the complicated story of Arianism, so bewildering to many beginners in the study of early Church history.

The period under discussion is difficult enough in all conscience, and the task before a translator who is not himself entirely at home in it is formidable. Dr Lee Woolf has tackled the problem before him with courage and resolution. All readers will wish to acknowledge with gratitude what he has given. Nevertheless, there are a number of places where the rendering he gives does not appear adequately to represent the meaning of the original German text. And in the footnotes there are some points at which the state of things does not seem entirely satisfactory.

Hans Lietzmann died in July, 1942. Accordingly, it was not possible for him to read through the English translation before publication. This is a pity. Dr Lee Woolf's translation often reads

well. But even the beginner in the study of this period will think it curious that Diocletian should be made to die twice—in December 304 (p. 67) and then again in December 316 (p. 78). The sentence on page 67, "During December, 304, he died", should read "In December, 304, it was even rumoured that he had died."

The account of the theology of Marcellus of Ancyra (p. 190 f.) is unfortunate. The translator has tried to be helpful, and has replaced the "he" (*er*) of Lietzmann's text by the name, not of Marcellus, but of Athanasius. In consequence the text ascribes a theology to Athanasius while the supporting footnotes refer to the fragments of Marcellus (who appears disguised as Marcellinus: p. 190, n. 3).

This last is a spectacular example of what the reader may expect in this book. There are, alas, other instances of misinterpretation which are equally disastrous. But these must be left, and a word said about the footnotes.

In his preface Dr Lee Woolf has been kind enough to express his thanks to the present reviewer for having "enriched the footnotes throughout, especially by references to works more readily accessible to English readers". Perhaps I may remark that there is not a single note in this book in which any material provided by me has been utilized.

Generally the footnotes are accurate and correct. And where they are not it does not very much matter. Footnotes are normally used only by those who are already fairly familiar with the sources. Such people will know at once what was really intended. They will not be distracted by such curiosities as "Syrer's Hexapla" (p. 164, n. 1), and it is a simple matter to correct "Augustus" (p. 84, n. 1) to Augustine. But it is here that the book seems also to need a thorough tidying-up. It is conventional to print the name of the author of a book in Roman type, the title of his work in italics. But in this volume it is sometimes a "hit or miss" affair which is taken to be which. Thus the historian Ammianus Marcellinus appears as Ammianus, author of a work entitled *Marcellinus* (p. 140, n. 3).

In short, in its present form this book can hardly be recommended. The errors in interpretation, though not very numerous, are serious enough to mar the work and to make it a dangerous volume to put into the hands of any who do not already know the fourth century well. The Lutterworth Press, however, are preparing a sheet of *corrigenda*, and with this constantly by one's side the book may be used with great advantage.

H. Chadwick.

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

Early Christian Baptism and the Creed. By Joseph H. Crehan, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 21s.

It is impossible for a summary to do justice to this closely reasoned piece of scholarship; indeed, as the writer himself points

out, his method "does not lead to facile and, as it were, blatant results". But if a reviewer may be allowed to present a very distant "air view" of it, a rough and ready statement of the thesis might run thus: the threefold formula of baptism in Matt. xxviii is Christ's own command, given during the forty days, and was consistently used from the earliest times. The reason why we do not find other references to it until after the N.T. period is that what is usually alluded to was the baptizand's own confession. This confession, or baptismal creed, as distinct from the threefold formula used by the ministrant of baptism, began as a simple invocation of Jesus as Lord. Gradually it developed into a twofold shape, with mention of the Father (an addition partly reflecting a reaction against Marcionism); and eventually reference to the Church and the Holy Spirit was added (possibly as a safeguard against Montanist errors). Thus skilfully the writer does justice to the evidence for the slow growth of a trinitarian creed, while at the same time attempting to retain the Matthæan formula as a dominical command.

Few scholars are likely to be convinced by the hypothesis of a distinction between baptizand's confession and baptizer's formula. It still does not explain why the earliest sources contain almost no allusion to a threefold formula, nor is it intrinsically likely; and why is so far-reaching a distinction itself never mentioned until, perhaps, the time of Cyprian (pp. 76, 77)? It is arbitrary to postulate a dominical command during the forty days, and then to proceed to fit the rest of the evidence to it, unless one is committed on independent grounds to a literal interpretation of the Matthæan passage.

Another matter for misgiving is the scant recognition accorded to Oscar Cullmann's *Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétiennes* (reviewed in this journal in April, 1949), which represents a most important contribution to the same theme—the genesis of the creed—but which is mentioned only in a footnote where a particular point in it is criticized. The work by W. F. Flemington, which appeared too late to be taken into account, is courteously acknowledged, although it is not entirely accurate to describe him as "one whose sole rule of faith is the Holy Scriptures".

But whatever criticism may be made cannot alter the fact that here is a most erudite and thorough contribution to the history of doctrine; and, even if it were not also suggestive and original, it would possess high value if only as a source-book for the study of the subject, for there are plentiful quotations from the essential documents. Examples of the painstaking thoroughness with which details are examined are the first appendix, presenting a full survey of the evidence about the famous crux of punctuation in John i, 3, 4, and the fourth appendix, in which a dozen pages are devoted to the text of Hippolytus, and Dix's "prejudice against the Ethiopic" version is challenged.

This is a difficult book on a complex subject; and it must be left to experts in the fields of patristics and the history of worship to decide how far the conclusions are valid. But in any case it bids fair to be an important book. The writer may be assured of the fulfil-

ment of the hopes which he modestly expresses when he writes: "If Catholics, or believing Christians of any church, have been led by this book to a better realization of the meaning of baptism and the richness of content in its theology, the writer will consider himself to have acheived more than a mere addition to the sum of knowledge."

C. F. D. Moule.

Clare College,
Cambridge.

The Biblical Doctrine of Election. By H. H. Rowley. Lutterworth Press. 14s.

This book is to be welcomed with thankfulness for its own sake, and even more if it is the precursor of a general trend of thinking. Three words in the title are specially significant. "The" implies that in spite of all the variety in the Bible there is an important unity on which we can rely; "doctrine" implies that we are concerned not merely with historical ideas but also with the truth by which we live; and "election" implies a grappling with a theme at once central to the Bible and offensive to the modern mind. In this book Biblical study, with all the gains of historical sifting—and the footnotes confirm the evidence of the text that it is written by a master of historical introduction—takes a new confident step forward into Biblical theology. A characteristic aspect of the method used is the anchoring of the subjective conviction of faith in objective facts which no one can rightly dispute. This is valuable, though the result is of only proximate validity. The historic influence of the Cross (pp. 158-60) proves that belief in it is no mere hallucination, but it does not establish that we ought to allow it to have the same influence in the future.

The theme of the book is that the initial tradition of Israel, whether associated with Abraham or with Moses, is that God chose Israel for His own purpose—not for privilege but for service. This election is an unconditional one, not one from which Israel can withdraw. It is both limited to the Remnant and expanded to include the Gentiles—in contrast with the thought of an elect nation from which Judaism never wholly emancipated itself. The election of individuals, of which the supreme instance is the Servant, follows the same pattern as the election of Israel. Nations and persons outside the Covenant are also chosen by God to serve His purpose in relation to Israel. In the final chapter on "The Heirs of Election" Dr Rowley vindicates the claim of the Church to be the New Israel in accordance with the teachings of the Old Testament itself, asserts that the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Christ or they can never be vindicated in history, and insists that if the Church is the heir of the election of Israel it is also heir of the warnings that her heritage is cast away if she is not loyal to the purpose of that election. "This Biblical doctrine of election", he concludes, "may be proclaimed without apology, and its proclamation is greatly to be desired to yield the foundation of a revived doctrine of the Church."

This is a great theme greatly expounded, and it will doubtless be studied widely, both for its central teaching and for its illuminating detail. Some minor criticisms may be mentioned. First, on particular points, the relation between the New Covenant in Christ and Jeremiah's prophecy is more complex than the author seems willing to allow (p. 142); and the argument that either the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Christ or they can never be fulfilled in history (p. 153: contrast p. 158)—though of great importance—rests almost on bare assertion. Secondly, on general issues, Dr Rowley limits himself to the thought of the Bible, but if we are moving from a factual concern with the contents of the Bible to the question of its truth, it would be an advantage to set the theme of Election in the context of the religious history of mankind. Dr Rowley, of course, is fully qualified to do this, and has given sufficient indication of his attitude (*cf.* pp. 38-9, 83, 138), but an introductory section devoted to the point would have been a gain. Also, in chapter III Dr Rowley unaccountably neglects the importance of Deuteronomy for the theme of the election of Israel, and takes up the theme of nationalistic limitation of election too far down the stream of history. But these are minor criticisms on a work of great importance.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the Sixteenth Century. By E. T. Davies. Blackwell. 10s. 6d.

This is not a very easy book in which to find one's way about, because it has no index and consists of three long chapters, while the page-heading is the same throughout both chapters 1 and 3, "The Teaching of Anglican Formularies." The subject-matter of the book is what writers and formularies have to say about Episcopacy and the Supremacy, their interrelation, with some examination of the Royal Supremacy itself.

Some points of criticism spring to the mind at once; for example, the suspension of Grindal is dismissed in two lines, while the completely Erastian position of Edward VI's reign, when bishops were appointed by Letters Patent and the short-lived bishopric of Westminster was dissolved, receive the scantiest notice. There is a misprint on p. 81—"labout" for "labour"—and "settled in England" (p. 31, n.) is an inappropriate description of Saravia's status. He was a Prebendary of Canterbury and Rector of Great Chart.

Mr Davies rightly emphasizes the conservative nature of the English Reformation, even if he does not sufficiently allow for the inconsistency of the Tudors. They were pragmatists, unlike the Stuarts, and were no more enamoured of the divine right of episcopacy than of the divine right of kings. Nor would they have esteemed the merits of Bilson's *Perpetual Government* as highly as Mr Davies, who uses it as a major piece of evidence, in the belief that it is "the most exhaustive treatment of episcopacy in sixteenth-

century Anglican literature, as well as one of the most important defences of episcopacy in the English language". That may be so, but it has been elsewhere summarily dismissed as "superfluously learned and unattractive" (*D.N.B.*). It is true that Saravia, Jewel, Whitgift, Hooker and others praised episcopacy as being ancient, making for order and continuity, but they do not make the further leap. Indeed, how could Saravia do so, unless he himself—and the evidence is to the contrary—had undergone ordination at the hands of the episcopate?

The gist of Mr Davies' book is that a trend may be discerned, as the sixteenth century wears on, from the earlier Erastianism to the Catholic view of episcopacy, both in writers, formularies and documents; and this same trend is to be seen, by way of illustration, in the development of Hooker's teaching on episcopacy from Book III to Book VII of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Hooker assumes, therefore, a large importance throughout the book.

Now four years ago the author wrote a small book on Hooker (S.P.C.K., 98 pp.), and we should hardly be entirely wrong in regarding his new book as an enlargement of that of 1946. In the latter Mr Davies maintained that the *Ecclesiastical Polity, as we have it*, is the authentic Hooker, and in particular that episcopacy is of divine right, instituted of God. "That this is the final judgment, no one who has read Hooker's *Laws* carefully will deny" (p. 89). In the present book he allows the appearance of arguments since 1946 casting doubts on the genuineness of Book VII of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, but, nevertheless, he determines that the teaching in that book is, on the whole, but a development of Book III.

There are those who will not agree that the author has made out his Hooker thesis. The first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* were written in London and published in 1593; Book V appeared in 1597 from Bishopsbourne; and when he died in 1600 Hooker had completed the eight books. For generations appeal was made to Book III by Churchmen and Dissenters as teaching episcopacy to be only of the *bene esse*, and forms of ecclesiastical government to be mutable, while in Book VII the bishop becomes essential to the existence of a Church, and monarchical prelacy is its theme. Assuming, as is reasonable, that Book III was written by 1590 and Book VII by 1598, what could have caused the most learned mind of the time thus to "develop"—if development there ever was? From what superior fount of learning had he drunk in the interim?

Further, we have reason to believe that Hooker was something of a "Government man"; we know that the Government was interested in his work and Covel said he undertook it "by appointment". Again, while we know that, in his earlier years, he had his Puritan uncle and Jewel for patrons, it is perhaps not known that in his mature days Hooker enjoyed the patronage of Leicester and Walsingham, both staunchly sympathetic to Protestantism. Thus the Minute Books of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury reveal that in January 1582—when Hooker was Fellow of Corpus and Reader in Hebrew—the Chapter, at the suit of Leicester and Walsingham,

undertook to pay him £5 6s. 8d. by the year (perhaps £250 in present money) for the furtherance of his study; and that study may well have been preliminary work for the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Since in the same year the City of Exeter guaranteed him a £4 annuity also, Hooker must have been very well off.[1] Moreover, he was a friend of William Waad, one of Walsingham's chief agents, and we are told by the writer of *State-Worthies* (ed. 1670, p. 601) that it was through Waad's encouragement that Hooker went to his task. Nobody may, on this evidence, suggest more than that Hooker enjoyed the patronage of men highly placed in the Government, and that he must have had his uses, but the force of all this—apart from any examination of Book VII—strengthens the present reviewer in his conclusion that Book III, and not Book VII, *as Gauden published it in 1662*, represents the genuine teaching of Hooker.

There are those who will not be satisfied that Mr Davies has proved his major case, though this is not to deny that he has made an interesting study. Not enough has been written on the teaching of Anglican formularies and documents, even if what they taught does not necessarily have the relevance the author would wish. Some will disagree, for example, with his exposition of 13 Eliz. cap xii (1571) on pp. 79-80. Mr Davies there defines this Act as "designed to prevent the infiltration of non-episcopally ordained ministers into the Church of England". Yet that Act did not demand reordination, but merely public acceptance of the XXXIX Articles, and Bishop Cosin gives to the Act an interpretation clean contrary to that of Mr Davies. Speaking of any French Church minister receiving a cure in the Anglican Church, he says, "Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the articles established" (*Works*, IV, p. 403); and the bishop goes on to state that he has known many cases, in and before his time, of such ministers admitted to a cure of souls without reordination, and to affirm (p. 449) that 13 Eliz. cap. xii had for its very purpose the admission of such ministers, quoting Hooker *Ecclesiastical Polity* (III) in support of the validity of their Orders. In fact, the Anglican Church had to wait almost 100 years for legislation restricting cures of souls to ministers episcopally ordained, and even then a *proviso* was inserted about foreign Reformed Churches. In any event, 13 Eliz. cap. xii, following as it did the rebellion of the Northern Earls in 1569 and the Papal Bull of deposition of 1570, had for its immediate purpose the testing of the loyalty of Marian priests in the Church of England.

JOHN SHIRLEY.

CANTERBURY.

THOU ART PETER. By A. D. Howell Smith. Watts and Co. 21s.

Here in 809 pages a Rationalist gives a survey of the nature, beliefs, practices, origins and history of the Roman Catholic Church.

[1] Fowler, *History of C.C.C.*, p. 150.

In his statements of fact he is remarkably well informed, remarkably accurate, and his presentation of them is on the whole moderate and restrained. Inevitably in the course of such a long book he makes some mistakes: his transliteration of Hebrew is very faulty (*e.g.*, pp. 45 and 69); a quotation from Justin on p. 256 (from I Apology lxxxvi, though Mr Howell Smith does not say so) makes no sense; throughout he speaks of baptism by *effusion* instead of affusion (p. 216, etc.); Bernard was not *bishop* of Clairvaux (p. 64); and in referring to Anglican monasticism (p. 732) he mixes up the Cowley and the Mirfield fathers, and gives a ridiculously prominent place to the "monks of Llanthony". There are a few misprints too, in English (pp. 188, 438 (note 4), and 739), Latin (pp. 47, 287), and Greek (pp. 584 and 778 (note 1 in each case)).

But to be well informed is not the same as to be theologically competent. Mr Howell Smith writes like a layman, quite unaware of recent theological movements. He has a very old-fashioned, cavalier attitude to the Fourth Gospel (*e.g.* pp. 34 and 46). His treatment in chapter IV of the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement is very superficial; he has apparently heard nothing of the meaning of *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* or of the significance of eschatology. His adoption of Loisy's view of Acts (p. 228) would find almost no champions now; at times, indeed, he displays an apparently unappeasable suspicion of all evidence of any kind on Biblical or historical questions. He has read almost nothing up to date on the origins of Baptism (pp. 235-44). In his account of the origins of the Eucharist he shows knowledge of the work of the Bishop of Birmingham (who perhaps alone of English theologians would find his views congenial), but not apparently of that of Dix, Cirlot, or Jeremias: his parade of pagan analogies for this sacrament (p. 252) is consequently unconvincing. The quotations from the Fathers with which his book is filled are all drawn from secondary sources, especially from the indefatigably anti-Romanist Turmel. Towards the end of the book he makes a pathetic attempt to envisage "humanist" monks (p. 736) and "humanist" sacraments (pp. 806-8).

When Mr Howell Smith leaves facts for conclusions drawn from facts, in short, his work drops steeply in value. In too many places his Rationalist prejudice, elsewhere kept firmly in hand, breaks devastatingly loose. "The psychology of conscience is not a mystery to the sociologist" (p. 31); "Jesus founded no Church" (p. 213); "some day the psychological training of confessors will be a task of science" (p. 326); "Byzantine stiffness and ugliness long influenced the art of Western Europe" (p. 477); "Religion cramped the painting and sculpture of Christendom" (p. 786)—phrases like these ring of cocksure generalization, not of rational argument. Similarly, there is a magnificent *non-sequitur* about the Canon of Scripture on p. 562; because all Christians from the earliest times did not accept *all* the books of the N.T. as authoritative, but hesitated about some, this does not mean that "the continuous witness disappears"; such an argument is fit only for schoolboys. There is a caricature of Byzantine history on p. 625. In his very inadequate attempt in the

last chapter to estimate the moral influence of Christianity he seems to have forgotten St Francis, Elizabeth Fry, Fr Damien, Dr Barnardo and all that these figures represent. And he makes no estimate whatever of the missionary expansion of the Christian Church during the last century and a half.

No doubt this book would have a wholesome steadying effect on any Roman Catholic who read it, but few Anglicans will find it valuable, except as a mirror of Rationalist opinion. We may desire to criticize or even to attack the Church of Rome, but—

non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Shuttleworth.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Assumption of Our Lady and Catholic Theology. By Victor Bennett and Raymond Winch. S.P.C.K. 5s.

In this book two Roman Catholic laymen argue that the definition of the Corporeal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin as a dogma could not be justified either by historical evidence or by theological theory, and therefore would have "unhappy repercussions on the prestige of the Papacy". "Either the Pope, by one erroneous pronouncement, would have disproved his infallibility, or the first principles of Catholic theology would have undergone a radical change, so that it would now be possible for the Roman Church to present as an article of belief in one age what she rejected in another." Even if the definition were justifiable in principle, it would be inopportune at the present time (*a*) because the cult of the Virgin in the Roman Church needs not additional encouragement but prudent restraint, and (*b*) because the new dogma would place obstacles in the way of ecumenical understanding. However this may be, the publication of the book is certainly opportune. Much of its interest is due to the fact that the authors are in intention orthodox Roman Catholics.

Unité Chrétienne et Tolérance Religieuse. Éditions du Temps Présent, Paris. 300 frs.

This is a notable collection of ecumenical articles and dialogues between Catholics and Protestants. It might be regarded as a French counterpart to *The Times* correspondence, *Catholicism To-day*, except that it contains some substantial historical and theological essays, and also that there are no spokesmen of intransigence on either side. Particularly moving by their forthcomingness and passion are two articles by the Abbé Couturier on the Massacre of St Bartholomew and on the treatment of Protestants in Spain. Most interesting doctrinally is the discussion of religious toleration, in which it is claimed by Père Pribilla that the Roman Church must now frankly and finally disavow Pius IX, who, in his Syllabus of

Errors, condemned the proposition: "Aetate hac nostra non amplius expedit, religionem catholicam haberi tanquam unicam status religionem, ceteris quibuscunque cultibus exclusis."

CONCORDANCE OF THE BIBLE IN THE MOFFATT TRANSLATION. Hodder and Stoughton. 52s. 6d.

It is a measure of the popularity of Dr Moffatt's translation of the Bible that the publishers have been moved to produce this handsome concordance. It contains between 60,000 and 70,000 references, and will be exceedingly useful to preachers and students who constantly handle the Moffatt Bible and also to hearers or readers of citations from it which they want to trace.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS (NASHVILLE 2, TENN.): J. Richard Spann (Ed.), *Fruits of Faith* ($2.50); Albert C. Knudson, *Basic Issues in Christian Thought* ($2.75).

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY: J. C. Heenan, *Six Torch Pamphlets* (3d. each).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *Deaconesses in the Church of England* (6d.).

DACRE PRESS: Roger Troisfontaines, S.J., *Existentialism and Christian Thought* (4s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: John T. Wilkinson (Ed.), Richard Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor* (8s. 6d.); J. Alexander Findlay, *Jesus and His Parables* (10s. 6d.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: John Ferguson, *The Enthronement of Love* (6s.); Michael Scott, *Africa Challenges our Faith* (1d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: T. E. Morris, *The Human Outlook* (8s. 6d.).

INDUSTRIAL CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP: *The Christian Doctrine of Work* (6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: J. N. D. Anderson (Ed.), *The World's Religions* (7s. 6d.).

LONGMAN'S: Thomas Nicklin, *Gospel Gleanings* (21s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (Schweich Lectures) (12s. 6d.).

PICKERING AND INGLIS: W. Graham Scroggie, *The Land and Life of Rest* (3s. 6d.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): F. Heiler and F. Siegmund-Schutze (Eds.), *Die Christlichenkirchen der Gegenwart: I. Teil, Die europäischen Kirchen* (n.p.).

S.C.M. PRESS: G. A. F. Knight, *Ruth and Jonah* (6s.); T. R. Milford, *Freedom and Discipline* (1s. 6d.); *Student Prayer* [A collection of prayers and forms of worship for the corporate and private use of students] (6s.); Ronald Gregor Smith (Ed.), *The Enduring Gospel* (7s. 6d.); J. B. Barron and H. M. Waddams, *Communism and the Churches* (4s.).

SKEFFINGTON AND SON: Emile Cammaerts, *For Better, For Worse* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Anon, *Inter-Communion* (6d.); *Church Commissioners for England* (Annual Report) (1s.); G. Parrinder, *The Bible and Polygamy* (2s. 6d.); Roland Bailey, *What is Existentialism?* (1s.).

WATTS AND CO.: A. Gowans Whyte, *The Task of Rationalism* (6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher